

1
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 DISTRICT OF NEVADA
4

5 Esperanza Zamora, individually;
6 Plaintiff,

7 v.

8 Walgreen Co. d/b/a Walgreen's; and
9 DOES 1 through 100; and ROE
10 CORPORATIONS 101 through 200,
11 Defendants.

Case No. 2:12-cv-01709-APG-NJK

**ORDER OVERRULING PLAINTIFF'S
OBJECTIONS TO ORDER DENYING
ADVERSE INFERENCE DUE TO
SPOILIATION OF EVIDENCE**

(Dkt. No. 42)

12 Before the Court is Plaintiff's Objections [Dkt. No. 42] to Magistrate Judge Koppe's
13 Order [Dkt. No. 34] regarding Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions [Dkt. No. 24].

14 A magistrate judge's ruling on a non-dispositive matter will be modified or set aside only
15 if "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a);
16 *Grimes v. City & Cnty. of San Francisco*, 951 F.2d 236, 241 (9th Cir. 1991). In reviewing for
17 clear error, a district judge may not simply substitute his or her judgment for that of the
18 magistrate judge. *See Grimes*, 951 F.2d at 241. A magistrate judge's ruling is clearly erroneous
19 only when the district court is left with a "definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been
20 committed." *Burdick v. Comm'r Internal Rev. Serv.*, 979 F.2d 1369, 1370 (9th Cir. 1992); *see*
21 *United States v. Abonce-Barrera*, 257 F.3d 959, 969 (9th Cir. 2001) (noting that a magistrate
22 judge's decisions about non-dispositive matters are entitled to great deference).

23 Upon careful review of the record in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), (B), and
24 (C) and Local Rule IB 3-1, the Court determines that Judge Koppe's ruling [Dkt. No. 34] is not
25 clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
26
27
28

1 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Koppe's Order [Dkt. No. 34] is
2 AFFIRMED, Plaintiff's Objections are overruled, and Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions [Dkt. No.
3 24] is DENIED.

4
5 DATED THIS 14th day of April, 2014.

6
7 

8 ANDREW P. GORDON
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28